

No 4. 77 pages

A BIBLE STUDY
OF
THE TWO OBSTACLES
BETWEEN
MAN AND HEAVEN

BY
SAMUEL SPAHR LAWS, D. D., LL. D.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

1903

A BIBLE STUDY
OF
THE TWO OBSTACLES
BETWEEN
MAN AND HEAVEN

BY
S. S. LAWS
WASHINGTON, D. C.

[Read before *The Presbyterian Ministers' Association* of Washington, D. C.; part 1 in May and part 2 in November, 1902. Whilst both parts were graciously received and commended, yet neither the Association nor any member of it is responsible for this publication, somewhat amplifying the original paper. The Rev. Dr. MacKelway asked for it for his excellent paper, *The Presbyterian Standard*, of Charlotte, N. C.; hence it is in print.]



6710

A BIBLE STUDY

It is from a study of our Bible that we learn the most important and the only rational lesson in the world's literature touching man's eternal destiny.

In the light of these Scriptures we see two, and only two, obstacles in the way of our entire race escaping from sin and entering Heaven. One is God's broken moral law, and the other is man's corrupt and enfeebled moral condition and character. Remove these and the door of Heaven swings wide open to man. If nothing is done, it remains forever effectively closed.

It is the special message of the Gospel to make known the provisions made for the removal of both these obstacles. It is proposed in this paper to consider them very briefly and in the order named.

PART I.

THE BROKEN LAW.

1. DEFINE THE MORAL LAW.—The moral law, with which we are here concerned, is God's settled mode of procedure with moral agents in his government of the world. This law underlies and is presupposed by the entire Gospel. Abstract it from the Gospel and the Gospel collapses and becomes chaos. Even the grace of God is unintelligible and meaningless apart from his justice. This law is a rational

expression of the holiness and justice of the divine nature. Sin is contrary to that nature, and hence it is in conflict with the will of God and with this his law. Now, the Apostle to the Gentiles lays "to the charge both of Jews and Greeks that they are all under sin; as it is written, there is none righteous; no, not one." This places all men, Jews and Gentiles alike, as sinners under the moral law as broken. Ignore or eliminate this law, which takes strict account of sin, and the justice and the love of God dwindle into a weak and unregulated sentimentalism, and the logic of the Gospel flutters at loose ends in the breezy cross-currents of every wind of doctrine. This is the situation of every man under the broken law of God when the word comes to him that the cross of Christ is available.

2. THE NATURE OF LAW.—Doubtless this must be understood to understand the Gospel. The moral law is the bed-rock on which the Gospel is built. Every law consists of two parts—its precept and its penalty. Omit the penalty and it becomes a mere rule of advice. The moral law is no exception. The claims of every broken law on those subject to it are twofold, preceptive and penal; and the claims of the broken moral law on every sinner are preceptive and penal. This arises from the nature of law as law. The infraction of the preceptive part, or requirement, incurs the penalty, but it neither abolishes nor relaxes the continuing binding force of the precept. The preceptive requirement continues in full vigor, although the penal consequence be suspended over the offender for every violation or departure till fully satisfied. The accumulation of penal liability, therefore, may vest without lessening the preceptive claims

of the law. Such theoretically is the exacting situation of those under law, and such is the actual situation of those subject to this perfect law perfectly administered.

3. How, then, can man settle his accumulated *penal liability*? As legal-tender money alone is recognized by man's law as paying a man's lawful debts, so in the moral government of God the only legal tender recognized in the court of Heaven in settlement of man's account under the moral law is righteousness. But men in their own character are destitute of this righteousness, according to the scriptural account of man's condition, for it is written and emphasized that "there is none righteous; no, not one. They have all turned aside. There is none that doeth good; no, not so much as one." For we have before laid to the charge both of Jews and Greeks that they are all under sin. "There is no distinction; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. There is none that seeketh after God; there is no fear of God before their eyes" (Rom. 3:9-23). All men in their consciousness know that this indictment is true. Man, therefore, is not only bankrupt of the means to settle his existing liability, but that liability is daily increasing. This is undoubtedly a desperate, a hopeless condition. Yet it is every man's actual situation, and it threatens to become permanent, with all its dire consequences, unless deliverance come from some outside source. It is in this ruined state of liability and helplessness that the cheering word of the Gospel announces to man that the very deliverance he needs has been provided and is available to him—that, in fact, it is freely offered to his acceptance, without money and without price, by the Lord Jesus Christ. Although this means of

deliverance was a costly purchase to Christ, he generously and magnanimously offers it as a gift to all who will accept it. "For Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness to every one that believeth" (Rom. x: 4).

4. Let us inquire more particularly what we are to specifically understand by this righteousness of Christ which has this saving power. It is of supreme importance that our notion of it should square with Scripture.

In general, the righteousness under present consideration is that which satisfies the claims of law, broken or unbroken.

The original word for righteousness in Romans x: 4, just quoted, is *δικαιοσύνη*—*dikaíosúnē*; and the same word occurs in Romans 1: 17, and there also, as here and elsewhere, it means that righteousness which satisfies the claims of God's law. It has primarily an objective sense, and does not designate an attribute of moral character in man or God. It is certainly not the righteousness of man, but his sinfulness, that is revealed in the Gospel. When Paul glories in the Gospel because a righteousness of God is therein revealed as "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," he cannot refer to its revelation of the attribute of justice in God's character, for that had driven man from Eden and pursued him, and would only have served to emphasize his condemnation and not to save the sinner. No. Paul evidently refers to the righteousness acquired by Christ in meeting the claims of divine justice as embodied and expressed in the broken moral law under which he was born, lived, and died.

And this righteousness is as distinct from his own personal moral attributes, and from the attribute of justice in

the Godhead as a worldly fortune from its creator and owner. It is an objective, and not a subjective, righteousness which the Lord Jesus Christ is here distinctively revealed as having acquired by perfectly conforming to the precepts of the law by his voluntary and holy obedience, together with "bearing the guilt or penalty, penal punishment, of our sins in his body on the tree" (1 Peter ii: 21-24). As it is written, "Now once, at the end of the ages, hath he been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. ix: 26). Whose sin? Surely not his own sin. "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us" (Gal. iii: 13). His death was penal and not a martyrdom, but a curse, a sacrifice, a sin offering. But "when he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, (he) sat down on the right hand of God" (Heb. x: 12). Such language would be grossly profane and inapplicable to any martyr that ever died. How blasphemous to affirm it of even the first martyr, Stephen!

The equipment of the Redeemer with a righteousness available for the rescue of himself from under the broken law and of sinners from their legal thralldom, because it meets the condemnatory as well as the preceptive claims of the broken law, was a distinct and marvelous acquisition. He did not have it prior to the incarnation. He did not bring it with him from Heaven. It was the supreme acquisition of his sojourn on earth. His resurrection and his ascension to the right hand of the Father, together with Pentecost, were the combined evidence, sanction, and seal of the acceptance of his work, and of the successful accomplishment of his mission of love to this earth for the acquisition of that unique treasure of righteousness which shall never

lose its redeeming and saving power—a righteousness suited to all our sinful race, sufficient for all, and offered freely to all (Heb. i: 3).

Before the incarnation the most favored nation had been subjected to a ceremonial pupilage preparatory to the unfolding in its fullness of this unique remedial scheme of deliverance. "But when the fullness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of woman, born under the law, that he might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons" (Gal. iv: 4). It was plainly under the ceremonial and moral law, therefore, where his mother and brethren stood, that the incarnate Son of God was born, lived without fault or sin, grew to manhood, suffered and died under the frown of Heaven.

There is a significant circumstance connected with the offering of the two birds at the presentation of her babe in the temple by Mary of vastly greater importance than its indication of her poverty. The Levitical law (Lev. xii: 6-8) provides "that one of these birds was for a burnt offering, and the other for sin offering." This was a confession and a proof that she was a sinner and, as such, under the broken law, and the circumcision of the babe ostensibly placed it alongside its mother in the attitude of a like subordination to the law. He was born under it, lived and died under it and in satisfaction of its two-fold claims. The satisfaction which Christ rendered the law constitutes his redeeming righteousness. It is an exhaustless fund out of which the indebtedness of every sinner may be paid. It is this objective righteousness of Christ that satisfies God's law and is from God, to which Paul refers when he says: * * * "I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but refuse,

that I may gain Christ and be found in Him, not having a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith." This righteousness which Paul reached forth and laid hold of outside of himself is not his own personal righteousness or moral character in any sense, but the acquired righteousness of Christ, which became his by faith when he was legally by faith or in covenant identified with Christ, so that what was Christ's became his and availed for his salvation (Phil. iii: 8, 9). Does it not simply amount to this: That the meritorious justifying righteousness is not man's personal righteousness in any sense whatever, but the righteousness of God provided by Christ and reckoned to his account as received by faith? But the righteousness of sanctification is personal righteousness.

The stipulation or covenant of works with Adam was his obedience of the unbroken law as the condition of confirmation in holiness and eternal life, and, being personally holy, he had both the natural and moral ability to render this obedience and maintain his integrity. The stipulation with Christ was his obedience of the broken law as the condition of his fulfilling the covenant of redemption. He took the law place of the fallen Adam. He undertook to render what was and is required of the fallen Adam, for which he was to receive a seed to serve him perpetually, and in subservience thereunto to have the mediatorial dominion of the universe until the end of this administration, but eternally the mediatorial relation to his redeemed people or spiritual body (Eph. i: 15-23; i Cor. xv: 24-28).

When Adam disobeyed the precept he was necessarily overtaken by the penalty of the law under which he stood;

his soul penally suffered the blight of sin in the loss of his moral ability or disposition to obey God, and his body became subject to the pains of death and perdition. The lapsed moral condition of Adam was an aspect of his punishment, and not the cause or reason of it. As transmitted to his natural offspring, it is termed original sin, and is therefore the penal consequence of their trial or probation and condemnation in him. It was not their seminal but their legal or covenant oneness with him that furnished the just and rational ground of this procedure with them. Omit the legal element from this primal transaction, and as the facts lie in our best information, it collapses into such confusion and gross arbitrariness that there is no possibility of justifying therein the ways of God to man.

Unless Adam's offspring were legally represented by him in his probation, there is no legal foundation for the treatment they have received in being born in a state of condemnation and sin. (Eph. 2:3.)

I do not see how the ways of God towards man in the fall and in redemption can be justified except upon the recognition of man's legal or covenant oneness with Adam in one case and with Christ in the other. The observance of the unbroken law was the stipulation or condition in the covenant with Adam called the covenant of works in Adam, and the meeting of the claims of the broken law, the condition of the covenant with Christ, properly called the covenant of redemption, which was with Christ, as with Adam, also a covenant of works and merit; so that all the blessings of salvation are due to Christ as the just and rightful reward of his perfect obedience and fulfillment of his covenant stipulation; but what comes to him of acquired right

is bestowed on us as a gift of grace, unearned and undeserved. Hence the covenant of redemption and the covenant of grace are only different aspects of the same covenant, the former pointing to Christ as redeemer, and the latter to the redeemed as beneficiaries. On this point the Confession of Faith is in confusion.

It must be forever conceded that there is no wrong nor vindictiveness, but only open, equal, and fair dealing in enforcing for disobedience the penalty of a just law upon all amenable to its righteous claims or in the bestowment of a stipulated reward of a fulfilled covenant. All the descendants of fallen Adam stood in him and fell with him, and have justly heired his penal condition, and will continue to be thus born, so far as God's ways are revealed to us, until the end of time. They inherit his natural ability or constitutional powers of soul, but not his criginal holiness and moral ability, nor even his fallible disposition to serve God—that is to say, they have in the fallen estate the intellect, the heart, the will, and the conscience with which to serve God, but the state of the soul is averse to God; the inclination and the disposition to do so are absent. These powers of the soul are in such condition or state as to be alienated from and averse to God, so that "they that are in the flesh cannot please God." It was for this reason that Christ said to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born again." But it must not be overlooked that it is man's natural ability, consisting of these inborn powers of soul that may know, love, and obey God, and not his moral ability or disposition to do so, that decides man's obligation to obey the law of God.

The incarnate Son of God was born under the broken law with both the natural and moral ability to meet and

perfectly satisfy its preceptive and also its penal claims; and he not only did so and effected his own triumphant deliverance, but in doing so he wrought out a righteousness which amply equips him as the redeemer and deliverer of all men in like condition from an otherwise hopeless thralldom. His acquired and exhaustless fortune of righteousness is fully adequate to save to the uttermost all who draw near to God through him. (Heb. vii : 25.)

5. The *vicarious* attitude of Christ in this entire procedure claims special attention, as aiding to an insight into its true nature. There are *two* entirely distinct aspects of sin which in this connection it is exceedingly important to notice. One is its penal *reatus*—its guilt or liability to the penalty or punishment. The other is its preceptive *culpa*—its defilement or corruption and evil desert. As Christ was holy and undefiled, in his humiliation, on assuming the sinner's law-place, his character being absolutely conformable to the precept, it was only the penal liability of sin which he had occasion to assume in order that he might stand for and be justly treated, as he was in fact, as a sinner of the deepest guilt. "He was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed."

This alleged vicarious aspect of the Saviour's life and death seems so original and anomalous that it challenges inquiry whether it may not be an alien notion fabricated and foisted into the case. But there is no novelty in it. The religious education of the Jewish people had of old familiarized them with the idea. It has been well remarked by a

converted Jewish scholar "that the difficulties of modern interpreters of the Messianic prophecies arise chiefly from their not perceiving the unity of the Old Testament in its progressive unfolding of the plan of salvation. As the Old Testament and Jewish tradition taught that the object of a sacrifice was its *substitution* for the offender, so Scripture and the Jewish fathers also teach that the substitute to whom all these types pointed was none other than the Messiah." *

The character of the Messiah as a sufferer is preëminently set forth in Isaiah. In the 52d and 53d chapters the Messiah's vicarious sufferings are described no less than twelve times.

It is interesting to notice with what unequivocal explicitness, in his recent work on Isaiah, the Rev. S. R. Driver, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford, England, an eminent so-called higher critic, sets forth, in commenting on these chapters of Isaiah, the vicariousness of Christ's sufferings. He accepts in good faith the prophetic and Messianic character of this Scripture, but it will be most satisfactory to quote his words. He says: "It will be observed that the idea of *vicarious suffering* is here distinctively enunciated; the subject of the prophecy suffers not *with* the guilty (involved with them in a common catastrophe), but *for* them." And again: "Whereas, in fact, it was *we* who had gone astray, and the penalty, instead of recoiling upon us, lighted in its entirety upon him, leaving us free. So far, in a word, from

*Such early works as the *Targum Jonathan* and the *Jerusalem Targum* frankly adopt the Messianic interpretation of these prophecies. It was only to avoid their application to the Nazarene that this interpretation was rejected for one applicable to Israel as a nation. ("The Temple" by Dr. Edersheim, p. 98.)

being guilty himself, he bore the guilt of others and relieved them of its penal consequences." *

Nothing could more effectively emphasize this vicarious view, which was the very heart of the preparatory system, and it is confirmed by the harmonious language of the New Testament Scripture, in which the Saviour is in terms spoken of as an offering and a sacrifice for sin as the lamb of God, and kindred passages. Said John, the forerunner, "Behold the lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1 : 29, 36). Says Peter, "Knowing that ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things, with silver or gold, * * * but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ" (1 Peter 1 : 19). When a lamb or other animal was offered as a sin offering the worshipper presenting it placed his hands on its head and confessed thereon his sins; and having thus, by divine direction, symbolically transferred to it the liability to the death penalty for sin, he then himself slew the lamb as his substitute or vicarious offering. Without the shedding of blood there was no forgiveness. The priest caught the blood in his bowl and disposed of it at the altar of atonement (Lev. iv : 32-35). "Christ, our passover, is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. vi : 7). This vicarious death of the sacrifice in the Jewish system typified, and was intended to be realized in, the Christ, the suffering Messiah. The Apostle Paul wrote to the Corinthians, reminding them of the gospel preached by him to them, "For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures" (1 Cor. xv : 1-3). The scriptural

* The underscoring is in the text, "Isaiah and His Times," pp. 153, 155; also 178, 179.

death for sin was vicarious. Undoubtedly, in point of law, we do what our representative does for us: *Qui facit per alium, facit per se*. Adam and Christ were not private, but public representative characters; those represented by Adam broke the law in him and became thereby as justly exposed as he to its penal consequences; those represented by Christ met the claims of the broken law in him and became the possessors of that righteousness "which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith" (Phil. 3 : 9). This legal antithesis is most concisely and clearly presented (Rom. v : 19): "For as through the one man's disobedience (Adam) the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one (Christ) shall the many be made righteous." The attempt to explain away this comprehensive and fundamental feature of God's ways to man is no better than quibbling. It is God's own plan.

The Son of God, in his own proper person, did not for the time divest or empty himself of the transcendent glories of Deity and, through the medium of human nature, voluntarily stoop to be born of a woman and born as a servant under the law for his own sake, as no such obligation rested upon him, but it was a voluntary humiliation for the sake of others, that he might redeem them that were under the law. Now, it is a negative fact of surprising interest that since the fall of Adam no promise has ever been given that any man should have heaven or any other gift as his reward were he to perfectly obey the law in his own proper person. There is no such promise to be found. The reason of it is plain enough. It was not possible for man to meet the condition. It would have been as irrational as, in the physical sphere, to promise a man a reward if he should jump over the moon. There are

just as downright impossibilities in the spiritual sphere as in the physical, and man's meeting the claims of the broken law is one of them. Such a promise would have been a mere bluff, and God does not trifle. No! So far as deliverance from the law is concerned, the only outlook for man himself has been, Do this and live; do this and live. But this is perpetual bondage. There has been no covenant made since Adam, except with the Christ, and the reason of its being made with him was his ability to make good its stipulation. Really, this is the very idea which Paul has in the main so concisely expressed in Galatians 2:15-16: "We being Jews by nature and not sinners of the Gentiles, yet knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law (*i. e.*, his own works of the law), but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law; because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." "And in none other is there salvation; for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved" (Acts iv:12).

The Gospel does not undertake to do for man what he can do for himself. If man could satisfy the claims of the broken law, there would have been no salvation except by man's own works. The Redeemer undertook to provide and did provide a redeeming righteousness for man because man could not provide it for himself. Man in his enfeebled condition could not keep the precept of the unbroken law, much less in addition meet the accumulated penal claims of it now broken.

Indeed, in his lapsed and sinful state, the Bible teaching, confirmed by experience, is that he is not only unable to keep or meet the claims of the broken law, but that, under

the blinding delusion of sin, such is his self-conceit and imagined self-righteousness that it is only by the constraining grace of God that he is able to practice that self-renunciation which enables him to realize his absolute dependence upon another as alone able to deliver him from the bondage of the broken law. Self-reliance within the sphere of one's competence is a great virtue and the very undergirding of character, but in the sphere of impotence it is consummate folly, and, where duty is involved, wrong and ruinous. The only rational and worthy course for the man wrecked in the whirling storm of mid-ocean is to renounce self-reliance and accept the rescue of the life-boat.

6. As a matter of course, the old problem of *the innocent suffering for the guilty* confronts us here. It is the innocent Christ who suffers for the guilty sinner. To many this is "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense." But a *Bible study* ought to clear it out of the way by exposing its plausible, but fatal, fallacy.

The specific work of the atonement, which wrought out the redeeming and saving righteousness spoken of in what precedes, includes everything in the life of the Son of God from the incarnation to the ascension. It has not been sufficiently noted—it might almost be said that it has been overlooked—that this procedure is a special modification and an exceptional episode in the moral government of God, *and out of analogy with the ordinary course of nature*. Hence inquirers, not having succeeded in finding its parallel in the ordinary course of nature, have unwisely fallen into an adverse conclusion, the only rectification of which is a truthful insight into the nature of the case on its own merits.

The 73d Psalm has for millenniums stood as a direct notification that the ordinary course of this world is by sin put out of joint. The Psalmist distinctly assures us that it was only when he went into the sanctuary of God and considered man's latter end and the adjustments of the future life that his faith in God was saved from collapse. The pleasures and pains of this life are not distributed according to desert. It is often the case that the wicked escape deserved punishment and flourish like green bay trees, whereas the righteous beg their bread and go mourning all their days. In his admirable essay on *Evolution and Ethics* (1893), Prof. Huxley makes some interesting suggestions and concessions. His general position is that "the cosmic process has no sort of relation to moral ends;" "that the ethical progress of society depends, not on imitating, but in [on] combating it;" that the seeming paradox that ethical nature is at enmity with cosmic nature is, nevertheless, "a truth as great as it is plain" (Huxley's Works, vol. ix, 83, and viii). In discoursing along this line he takes occasion to remark "that thousands upon thousands of innocent beings suffer for the crime or unintentional trespass of one." The material in support of this view that multitudes of the blameless suffer and perish from the fatal operation of the sins of others is abundant. A common motive of tragedy, ancient and modern, has been the unfathomable injustice of the nature of things. Man's inhumanity to man has made countless thousands mourn. *Cædipus* was blameless, but by the natural sequence of the cosmical process he was driven to slay his father and wed his mother, "to the desolation of his people and his own headlong ruin." And *Hamlet*, the no

less blameless dreamer, was in spite of himself dragged into a world out of joint; involved in a tangle of crime and misery created by one of the prime agents of the cosmic process as it works in and through man (*ibid.*, p. 58). The noted J. S. Mill, in studying this problem, so far lost his balance as to conclude, as Augustine when playing the philosopher, before he became Christian, had done, for the Manichæan ground, that the mixed condition of this world's events points to a creator neither perfectly good nor omnipotent.

In the early church controversies Origen, in the first half of the third century, in answering Celsus, and in more modern days Bishop Butler, in *The Analogy*, in the first half of the eighteenth century, and various other distinguished authors and divines, have vainly sought to justify the ways of God in the case of the vicarious service and sufferings of Christ by an appeal to the natural course of events, the so-called cosmic process. But the conscience of man revolts at and is dumfounded by the moral indifference of nature and sympathizes with the outlook of the Psalmist for further light. There is an initial presumption that the providential procedure of the atonement, if founded and conducted on the strict principles of eternal justice and equity as well as of love, to remedy the discordant evils of the cosmos, would transcend and differ from its ordinary processes; and thus we find that, at every step, it moves in the realm of the supernatural and the miraculous, which are not identical, but are akin and closely allied. There are nearly one hundred miracles recorded in the Old and New Testaments, and not one of them is reducible to the laws of nature, and therefore they are not scientific events; yet there was, in the direct

action of God's power, an adequate cause of their occurrence. This action, however, is not uniform, and hence is not reducible to law. It is believed that the abstract conception of no miracle in the Bible is susceptible of theoretical explanation by reference of it to a law of nature, notwithstanding the great progress of the sciences. All the known laws of nature are reduced to abstract conceptions. Whether the events occurred or not, therefore, the recorded conceptions of them present a problem, in that they transcend the sciences; and hence, instead of the recorded miracles weakening the Gospel, their evidence cumulatively strengthens it by their inexplicability by the most advanced sciences. Such occurrences compel the rational recognition of an energy beyond and other than that of nature. The energy supremely manifested by the earthly career of the Messiah from birth to ascension was of this transcendent kind. The Saviour's earthly career is not reducible to nature's formulas. The miracles and supernatural events thereof, having an adequate cause, are philosophic, though not reducible to law.

The Saviour's life, in its most profound differential characteristics, was not designed to be an example and is inimitable.

In all the instances adduced or adducible from the cosmic process of the innocent suffering for or on account of the guilty, there are at least three fatal points of disparity between them and the Messianic procedure.

1. In these cosmic instances the sufferers have no freedom of choice. The wife, children, kindred, and friends of the criminal, the executed criminal, or the abandoned drunkard are the helpless, as well as the innocent, victims of the misdeeds of the guilty ones. Yet how common the sad cases.

2. In the *second* place, the suffering of the innocent in these cases has no legal and little, if any, moral influence or effect on the guilty.

3. A *third* disparity is the total absence of motive on the part of the sufferers. It is merely passive endurance of what has overtaken them as an unavoidable calamity.

This appeal to the course of nature for illustration and support of the vicarious sufferings of Christ is, therefore, a radical mistake. He who makes it fails to perceive the palpable inversion of the relations of the parties. And as analogy is the resemblance of relations, the very basis of analogy is subverted and swept away. The supposed semblance is a ghostly delusion.

Now turn to the simple but profound language of the Redeemer himself, covering the very issue involved. In the Gospel of John x: 7-18: "I am the good shepherd. * * * I lay down my life for the sheep. No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself."

Here is perfect freedom and choice, and the benefit to accrue to others—to the guilty ones—is the motive of the action. The atmosphere is at once almost wholly cleared of its malarial murkiness and sunshine illumines the scene.

But look again and listen to these words: "I have power—*ἐξουσία*, *eksousia*—rightful power, to lay it down, and I have rightful power to take it again." Here is the amazing assertion of rightful power over his own life which no mere creature could affirm. This is a declaration of his competence and perfect right to engage in this transaction involving life and death. But wait, the crowning circumstance is still to be mentioned, and it should silence every cavil. The whole procedure was not only freely and of perfect right undertaken by him and approved by the Father, but

was actually authorized and commanded of the Father: "This commandment received I from my Father."

Behold! all is now in a glow of light shed down from the very throne of God. Thus, viewed strictly from the standpoint of *a Bible study*, without pursuing the matter more in detail, it may be safely submitted that it is not possible to find, nor to conjecture, a valid objection to or criticism of *this vicarious transaction* in which the innocent Redeemer suffered for the guilty sinner. He had the perfect right and the full sanction of Heaven to do what he did. Hence there was no one in the universe competent to question it and object. And he had an adequate and an infinitely important and sufficient reason or motive for what he did. The whole transaction, therefore, was preëminently reasonable, wise, and just, and infinitely merciful, and is entitled, on its own inherent merits, to be esteemed the standard of judgment to be passed on the cosmic process rather than the reverse.

The considerations submitted serve to show that the vicarious suffering of the innocent for the guilty in the case of Jesus Christ is not an arbitrary and conventional procedure, but is strictly founded in reason, justice, and supreme benevolence. It is thoroughly justifiable and commendable on its inherent merits. It brought into requisition more than human resources.

7. The truth which the endeavor has now been made to state with simplicity and clearness is commonly termed the doctrine of the atonement. On its Godward side and on its manward side it is primarily realized in justification. And no better definition of justification has ever been given, or is likely to be given, than that in the Shorter Westminster

Catechism: "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us and received by faith alone."

Attention will be given later to what should be esteemed the proper understanding of the clause, "accepteth us as righteous in his sight."

What is meant by the righteousness of Christ has been brought forth in an earnest search for the truth and in simple terms made intelligible to the wayfarer; and the Bible solution of the problem how can man be just with God, or, conversely, how can God be just and yet justify the sinner, has been concisely enunciated. This is the Bible's answer to the question; and it all has a direct bearing on the removal of the legal obstacle in the way of man's salvation from sin.

Nature knows nothing of justification and forgiveness. She makes no promises, no covenants, but ever and anon proclaims in fulminating tones from the skies, *Do this and live*—DO THIS AND LIVE: "Cursed is every one who continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law (not merely in parchment or stone, but in the fleshly tablets of the soul) to do them" (Gal. 3: 10; Rom. 2: 13-15). Nature knows no mediator or Saviour. No; it leaves man as does Buddhism or Confucianism, absolutely alone, to battle with the problems of life. But Christianity concedes to man all that can be justly and rationally claimed for him, and then, by a wholly supernatural mediatorial system of interposition, supplies what is lacking. It is in this light that the fundamental doctrine of the atonement must be viewed to be understood and appreciated, as the divinely

appointed and provided remedy for the legal obstacle that bars man's way to heaven.

Those who profess to preach this Gospel and eliminate from it its supernatural and legal elements, set at defiance the injunction of the Apostle and incur his condemnation: "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers—bishops—to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood. I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them" (Acts xx: 28-30). The church was purchased not by example but by blood, without the shedding of which there is no remission. To those who obey not this truth, but seek the favor of men by vainly attempting to popularize or modernize the Gospel as a merely paternal or rationalistic system, the language of Paul to the disturbers of the soundness of doctrine and of the peace of the Church of the Galatians may be justly applied as the warning of a fearful responsibility:

"I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel, which is not another gospel; only there are some that trouble you and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we or an angel from Heaven should preach unto you any Gospel other than that which was preached unto you, let him be anathema. As we have said before, so say I now again, If any man preacheth unto you any Gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema. For am I now seeking the favor of men or of God, or am I striving to please men? If I were still pleasing men I should not be a servant of Christ" (Gal. 1: 6-10).

A BIBLE STUDY.

PART II.

In the opening of this paper, read before this association—"The Presbyterian Ministerial Association of Washington City and Vicinity"—on a previous occasion (May, 1902) it was stated that "in the light of these Scriptures we see two, and only two, obstacles in the way of our entire race escaping from sin and entering Heaven: one is God's broken law, and the other is man's sinful character. Remove these and the door of Heaven swings wide open. If nothing be done, it remains forever effectually closed."

As only that portion of the paper relating to the legal obstacle was read on the former occasion, the part that treats of the moral obstacle will now be submitted by request (November 10, 1902). The discussion is not intended to be discursive and ecclesiastical, but simply Biblical, without pretending to be exhaustive.

THE MORAL OBSTACLE—MAN'S SINFUL CHARACTER.

1. The redemption provided by the incarnate Mediator as prophet, priest, and king would not, apart from the work of the Holy Spirit, save a single soul. It would be a richly spread banquet in the midst of the starving multitudes and yet without a guest.

Hence we learn, and it is especially noteworthy, that one of the primary effects of the service and satisfaction rendered by Christ was the removal, in some way not explained, of an otherwise insuperable obstacle in the way of the procession

of the Holy Spirit from the Father and of his being sent by the Son. The classic Scripture relative to this matter is John xiv : 14–21, xv : 26, with John xvi : 7–15 and vii : 39. To select a single verse : “ Nevertheless I tell you the truth : it is expedient for you that I go away ; for if I go not away, the Comforter (ὁ παράκλητος—*paracletos*) will not come unto you ; but if I go away I will send him unto you ” (xvi : 7). Pentecost was the initiative of this enduring promise. This topic gave rise to the *Filioque* controversy in the early church, and the blighted spiritual condition of the Greek Church, which denied the mission of the Spirit from the Son, as well as His procession from the Father, is a matter of history.

The view that regards Pentecost as the completion of the passover festival, the two thus constituting one feast, is not only favored by certain ceremonial details, blending in retrospect the exodus from Egypt and the giving of the law, but it is entitled to consideration as significantly pointing to the oneness and coöperation of the services of the second and third persons of the Trinity in practically initiating and completing the work of deliverance from the bondage of sin—“ the power of sin is the law ”—contemplated by them and the Father in their joint covenant of redemption and grace. The plain import of this suggestive view of the unification of these feasts is that the forensic, legal righteousness wrought out *for* us by the Son of God and the personal righteousness wrought *in* us by the Spirit of God—*i. e.*, justifying righteousness, together with sanctifying righteousness—constitute the one complete righteousness required of us in completely satisfying the divine claims of the pure and holy God on every sinner. This is the consummation attained on the re-

moval of these two obstacles. Our administration is pre-eminently the administration of the Holy Spirit. The righteousness of justification for penal deliverance from the law, wrought out *for* us by the Son of God should not be confounded, as is so often done, with the righteousness of sanctification wrought in us by the Spirit of God as delivering us from the worse than Egyptian internal bondage of sin. One is objective and the other is subjective; one is internal and personal and the other is external and putative. To provide a forensic or legal righteousness was the special work of the Christ; but to put man in the actual possession of it by faith and to transform his personal character into conformity therewith, this is the work undertaken by the Holy Spirit. This inner righteousness, which constitutes character, is not an infusion, nor a transfusion from without, but an internal transformation, a change in the moral state of the soul, which is "transformed from glory to glory even as from the Lord the Spirit" (2 Cor. iii:18).

2. As to man's moral condition, nothing is more plainly taught in the Bible and confirmed by history than man's demoralization and urgent need of the very work which the Holy Spirit has undertaken in his behalf.

In the language of the Psalmist (Ps. xiv), "They (all men) are corrupt; they have done abominable works; there is none that doeth good. Jehovah looked down from heaven upon the children of men to see if there were any that did understand, that did seek after God. They are all gone aside; they are together become filthy; there is none that doeth good; no, not one." The figure in this passage is that of a bird craning its neck and looking down and around in

search of some object; but no pure and sinless individual of the race is found. As previously indicated, the Apostle Paul, in his letter to the Romans, quotes and applies this language of the Psalmist in placing Jews and Gentiles on the same footing under the broken law as naturally corrupt and condemned. He emphasizes it by adding the declaration, "There is none righteous; no, not one." Man's experience fully sustains the indictment (Rom. iii: 9-20).

In meditating on the love of God for this sinful world that impelled him to send forth the Son and the Holy Spirit for its salvation, the mind experiences no little perplexity, for the reason that we cannot think otherwise than that some ground of perceived excellence and congeniality in the object is necessary to the exercise of love, even on the part of the sovereign God. What is it in man that meets this demand and shows the genuine reasonableness of this movement of saving love? There must be something in man besides his sin or such love would have been absolutely impossible. Perhaps some relief may be found by pointing out that, so far from sin being the whole of man, it is not even a property or essential constituent of his make-up as man. It is an accident and even a separable accident. Perhaps I may be allowed to appropriate from class-room an illustration of this perfectly valid but somewhat technical distinction. It was a university class of about eighty mature young men and some young women, in logic. The distinction just intimated having been made between property and accident, the next question related to the different kinds of accident. It came to a young woman, who correctly answered that there are two kinds of accidents—the separable and the inseparable. For illustration of the inseparable accident, she

mentioned that she was born in the State where the university was located and could not be other than a native of that State. Being then asked for an illustration of the separable accident, her eyes rolled around, seemingly in search of it, the class being all attention, when suddenly she emphatically answered, *moustache*. The class exploded. The answer, though colloquial, was correct and apt. Sin is no more a necessary constituent in the constitutional make-up of man than moustache, and although it may not be so easily separated or removed, still it is in fact as really separable. Today Adam is sinless; tomorrow he is sinful; but he does not cease to be a man. Some days or years thereafter, it may be, he is pardoned, sanctified, glorified, but he does not cease to be a man when thus divested of sin and transformed; indeed, he is then more of a man than before. In all of the essential characteristics of manhood, he is the same individual personality in all these conditions and changes. The leprosy of sin mars manhood, but does not extinguish it. Luther, it is said, was asked where the church was before the Reformation, and he answered, "Where was your face this morning before it was washed?" Paul exhorts the Ephesians to put off the old man and to put on the new man. Leprosy still baffles human skill, but the Saviour healed ten on a single occasion. This revealed his deity.

After the fall, man was a ruin, but it was a ruin so noble as to command divine regard. It was like the ruins of a temple or a palace whose grandeur and magnificence are not wholly extinguished, but are half revealed by the broken columns, the fragments of the frieze and cornice and architrave of the entablature, the shattered and moss-grown walls and towers. The genius who originally constructed the edifice

would detect in the sad ruins before him sufficient traces of his own handiwork, amidst the desolation, to mingle admiration with his sadness.

I find the following pertinent language of Augustine quoted by Calvin, with approval, in his Institutes (B. 2, 16, 4): "Therefore our reconciliation by the death of Christ must not be understood as if he reconciled us to God, that God might begin to love those whom he had before hated; but we are reconciled to him who already loved us, but with whom we were at enmity on account of sin. And whether my assertion be true let the Apostle attest: 'God,' says he, 'commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us' (Rom. v: 8). He loved us, therefore, even when we were in the exercise of enmity against him and engaged in the practice of iniquity. Wherefore, in a wonderful and divine manner, he both hated and loved us at the same time. He hated us as being different from what he had made us; but as our iniquity had not entirely destroyed his work in us, he could at the same time in every one of us hate what we had done and love what had proceeded from himself."

There is here a suggestion of vital importance in the adjustment of the relation of justice and love. Both of these attributes are equally essential and eternally distinct forms of perfection in the character of God. Sin had invoked the inevitable punitive destructive agency of justice before love projected, in view of it, the mission of rescue in harmony with the claims of justice, from the present and final ruin. This necessary presupposition of justice so wilfully ignored by man is never forgotten by God. It is sharply disclosed in that notable passage in the Saviour's interview with

Nicodemus (John iii : 16-17): "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through him." Love, then, sent the Son to save the lost, by propitiating offended justice and giving man a new heart.

What was in man besides his sin made him a most noble ruin, but nevertheless the sadder ruin. God saw what was there and also its glorious possibilities, and his Son rushed down from the shining heights.

3. The Holy Spirit humbles himself on entering the vile abodes of sin to dwell and minister there, as truly as the Son humbled himself by the incarnation.*

As the Holy Spirit performs his part of the covenant by engaging in the work of applying Christ's redemption by imparting new life to the souls of men and nourishing it to maturity, He finds all alike in their need of the spiritual birth. But in effecting the consequent transformation and conformation to the image of the Son, he finds two classes of sinners so unlike in the practical treatment required that there is good reason for sharply distinguishing them: These are infants and adults.

✓ a. But *who* are infants? Legally, they are minors or those who cannot speak in court for themselves. Morally and religiously infants must include all children prior to

*In a posthumous essay of Jonathan Edwards he argues that as the Holy Spirit made no sacrifice as did the Son, hence the covenant of redemption is solely between the Father and the Son, and the Holy Spirit is not a party to it. The Church and theological authorship have largely fallen into this egregious mistake.

the age of personal responsibility for wrong doing. An authority observes: "Natural infancy is that period of non-responsibility which, by presumption of law, ends with the seventh year of the person's age." Competence to take an oath, which implies the responsibility for the crime of perjury, and is therefore of the nature of a test of responsibility, was formerly fixed at a given age, but courts now examine a young person offered as a witness. The initial age of responsible discretion doubtless varies, but it is a reasonable opinion that it may range generally from five to seven. It seems to be well ascertained that lasting memory does not as a rule go back of about the close of the third year. Mr. Darwin claimed that his memory did not go back of four. If six then be taken as a reasonable average upward limit of the age of moral infancy, *the number* of children that die before that age is attained may be approximately computed. It is surprisingly large. The total population of the earth is estimated to be about at least (1,500,000,000) fifteen hundred millions. The average age of man is reckoned at thirty years; then fifty million, on the average, must die annually. Births and deaths are about equal, and six years being one-fifth of thirty years, the result is that one-fifth of fifty millions of this age die annually, or over twenty-seven thousand die daily under six. This estimate is probably too low. The question of infant salvation, therefore, is a question of tremendous import.

Infants cannot respond to the outward and ordinary call of the Gospel and are incapable of faith and of works. There is no Scripture warrant to say that they are innocent or sinless, and if so they would not need a Saviour nor be fit subjects for Heaven, which is the abode of pardoned and sancti-

fied sinners. "The covenant being made with Adam, not only for himself, but for his posterity, all mankind, descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him and fell with him in his first transgression." Hence these infants are participants of the estate whereinto man fell, which consists of the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and of that sinfulness which is commonly called original sin. But infants are not chargeable with actual transgressions which proceed from this corruption, as is the case with adults. In the language of Dr. Chalmers, "Adam has transmitted a guilt the same with his own, as well as a depravity the same with his own" (Chal. on Rom., 127, col. *b*, and 129, col. *a*). And Jonathan Edwards vindicates the justice of God "concerning the derivation of depravity and guilt from Adam to his posterity." as "plainly and fully taught in his holy Word."

The notion that sin and virtue attach only to acts, and that character is only the product of personal action, is erroneous. Adam as created had character; infants as born have character. Actions presuppose character as the fruit reveals the character of the tree.

If *the legal element* in our relation to Adam be ignored, the whole subject falls into hopeless vagueness and inexplicable confusion—a mere matter of conjectural moralizing; and just the same results follow as on ignoring, or disregarding as fundamental, the legal element in our relation to the second Adam. In my own language, used by another: "In other words, our legal and not our natural oneness with Adam made his disobedience our disobedience as truly and justly as though the act had been our own personal act; just as our legal and covenant oneness with Christ makes his satis-

faction of the law our satisfaction as real and actual as though personal by us." The *physical death* of infants is the providential and divinely appointed sensible proof positive of their suffering for Adam's sin, and that implies a just and a fair probation in him without, as with Adam himself, a literal and active personal participation in the disobedience (Rom. v: 14).

To speak of sinful character as inherited from fallen Adam is no explanation, but a mere statement of the fact to be explained.

The soul that sinneth, it shall die is not to be understood as excluding the representative sinning in Adam, and those guilty of actual transgression voluntarily become thereby accessories to Adam's sin after the fact. The thing asserted is individual responsibility, and it is denied that there is any such federal relation betwixt children and their ancestors other than Adam as to make them responsible for their mis-doing as for his.

But the notion that men are responsible for or receive benefits and evil only from their personal acts is at fault. If true, the business and social and moral world would at once be in a deadlock. Daily observation and experience disprove it. And what holds true of the fall of infants as to personal participation is in like manner realized in their salvation.

Without any individual or actual participation in the procedure, the Holy Spirit sets down the meritorious righteousness of Christ to the account and benefit of the infant as satisfying the legal penalty or curse, and thereupon proceeds to remove the moral obstacle or internal turpitude and power of sin by regenerating and establishing the child in

holiness, an internal condition corresponding and in harmony with the imputed righteousness. The guilt of sin is thus blotted out and its dominating defilement is washed away. It is, therefore, because infants are sinful that they can be and are saved by grace. Christ's righteousness calls for and demands all the blessings of salvation as his right by purchase under the stipulation of the covenant of redemption that he should have a seed to serve him. But what is his by covenant right comes to his followers as a gift of grace or benefaction. Internal sanctification or personal holiness of character as matching the accredited righteousness of Christ is inseparably conjoined therewith. They are the obverse and reverse of the current coin of the Kingdom.

There seems to be no reasonable question but that we have in such a case as that of infants a direct or immediate imputation of Christ's righteousness, accompanied or meritoriously followed by a direct new creation by the Holy Spirit in holiness, as certainly as the imputation of Adam's guilt (*reatus*) was followed by sinfulness (*culpa*). How can this new creation be expressed better than in the Westminster Confession of Faith where it says, "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth." The antithetic clause is, "So also are all other elect persons * * * incapable of the outward call"—*i. e.*, adult idiots and insane. (Ch. x : 3.)

There is agreement as to inheriting Adam's sinfulness, but some make it merely a matter of natural descent, and then make it the medium or ground of visiting the legal consequences of Adam's sin; others more wisely regard original

sin as penal. The only assignable ground of mediate imputation is the false philosophy of realism.

The question whether all infants that die before they attain the age of discretion and moral accountability—that is, before they attain the minimum age and estate of adults—are saved is one that has perplexed the most serious inquirers. Touching that point, the language of the book just quoted is equivocal. Sacramentarians, who have embodied in their doctrine of the sacraments baptismal regeneration, exclude from heaven all but a mere handful of the hosts of dying and deceased infants. It was doubtless against this narrow and arbitrary, this unscriptural and shocking view that the liberal and more scriptural deliverance in the Confession of Faith (ch. x: 3) in regard to elect infants was drawn. The salvation of infants and incompetents is not limited by church ordinances, but is due to the free executive work of the Holy Spirit. It is perfectly certain that all infants are not elect in any true and saving sense, as is sadly manifest in the lives of multitudes that survive infancy and grow up to adult years.

The extent of infant salvation is not directly asserted, nor necessarily implied, in the language “elect infants dying in infancy are saved.” The grammatical subject of this sentence is the noun “infants.” This noun has two modifying adjuncts, *elect* and *dying in infancy*. It is agreed that all the elect are saved, and, of course, this includes all *elect infants*, whether they die in infancy or not. But it is manifest that all infants are not elect, as is sadly shown by the ungodly lives of multitudes who survive infancy. All poets are men; not all men are poets; all elect infants are saved; not all infants are elect. The other qualifying adjunct, “*dying in*

infancy," is the sole reliance, therefore, for giving universality to this subject, as "elect" does not do so. When a term is taken in its widest sense it is said to be distributed, and the signs of distribution are simple and familiar, such as *all*, *each*, *every*, *any*, *none*, *not one*, *no one*, &c. This rule is easily applied. Thus: *All* infants dying in infancy are saved; *every*, *each*, infant dying in infancy is saved, &c. In the absence of any sign of the extent in which the subject "infants" is taken, it is not surprising that discord should be the consequence. We see that when the sign of distribution or maximum extension is used there is no opening for a difference of opinion as to whether the subject includes some or all infants dying in infancy. The language of the Confession of Faith, x, 3, does not determine the inference, for it is indefinite.

It seems hardly needful to say that such equivocation should be removed from any credal statement by revision, exposition, or annotation; but it cannot be truthfully denied that the overwhelming faith of Presbyterians who accept the Confession accepts the universal salvation of infants dying in infancy as the teaching of God's Word, however they may differ as to this language of the creed. The explanation of this seems to be, that they have learned this doctrine more from the Bible, by a semi-conscious inference, than from the Confession of Faith.

Unless this doctrine has a reasonable warrant from the sacred Scriptures, however, it has no claim on our religious faith, although it were set forth in an explicit and unequivocal credal statement. As a matter of fact, there is not in the Bible a verbal declaration of the universal salvation of infants, and yet it is believed that the materials of a valid

inference in its support, as in other cases, are found therein. I now propose to submit what I shall term a Bible argument in support of this doctrine of the salvation of *all* "infants dying in infancy."

Let it be understood that to argue simply means to marshal evidence, and that the case before us, like all the practical questions of life, admits of only probable or contingent proof, which has all degrees, from bare presumption to moral certainty. It is only in the narrow sphere of the pure mathematics that we have demonstration which admits of no degrees. In probable reasoning, both reason and faith side with bare preponderance of evidence or presumption. On principle, therefore, it appears fallacious to hold that credal faith accepts only doctrines sustained by moral certainty. Courts and juries demand moral certainty, or the removal of all doubt, in cases of life and death, but it is not exacted in the ordinary affairs of life. It was a wise saying of Bishop Butler that probability is the guide of life, and valid presumption is valid probability. Although it is the lowest, yet it is a sure and safe rung in the ascending ladder of proof and cannot be ignored. If, therefore, in the absence of explicit declaration we, nevertheless, find a valid scriptural inference in support of the salvation of all infants dying in infancy, the conclusion transcends mere conjecture or opinion and becomes a doctrine of faith. Of course, fundamental doctrines require a higher degree of proof than others.

The passages in the Gospels which offer a special study in this connection are the following: Matt. xviii:1-35, and xix:13-15; Mark ix:33-50, and x:13-16; Luke ix:46-50, and xviii:15-17.

A large part of our credal doctrines rest on inferences of various degrees. The same is true of all the sciences.

1. These passages in the gospels where the Saviour laid his hands on children and took them in his arms and blessed them are made to do heavy duty in this connection, touching the fact and extent of infant salvation, and properly.

There are two distinct instances in which the Saviour gave his disciples an object-lesson from babes and little children. Each of these instances is narrated by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The occasion of one of these child-lessons was the ambitious disputation among the disciples as to their relative preëminence in the prospective kingdom; and the occasion, in the other case, was the spontaneous presentation of babes (*βρέφη*) and little children (*παιδιά*) by mothers and friends for his blessing; and when the disciples officiously undertook to restrain this movement, and Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, rebuked them, and said: "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the Kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms and blessed them, laying his hands upon them" (Mark x: 14-16). The Saviour's object-lesson in the two cases is substantially the same, but in the former case he grouped or classed the humbled disciples with the little children as partakers of a like character and destiny. Nor does there seem to be any sufficient reason for dissociating them when afterwards spoken of as among the believing. "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become

as little children ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." "And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me" (Matt. xviii: 3, 5). The lesson was cogently enforced in the correction of bigotry and worldly selfishness in warning against the peril of offending these little ones and also their angels who behold the Father's face and are sent forth to minister to the heirs of salvation, and likewise in impressively illustrating the mission to save the cost by the search for the one sheep that had strayed from the ninety and nine in the fold. This shows the shepherd's zeal for every one in the flock, to save it from peril.

As I understand it, the general conclusion from these lessons and reflections is concisely stated by the Saviour in these words: "*Even so it is not the will of my (your) Father who is in Heaven that one of these little ones should perish*" (Matt. xviii: 14). The exhaustive alternatives in contemplation here are to perish or to be saved. There is no middle ground. All that are excluded from one of these alternatives are necessarily included in the other. The conclusion as stated is a universal negative proposition and excludes, therefore, all the little ones, whoever they may be, from the alternative *to perish* and includes them in the alternative *to be saved*. An expedition starts for Egypt and Palestine and a life insurance company, to inspire confidence, guarantees under penalty that not one of the passengers or crew of the vessel should die on the trip or excursion. That would be a guarantee, for whatever it was worth, that all would finish the voyage and return alive.

This verse gives the key-note of these object-lessons.

The only open question is this: Who are "these little ones"? The answer must be found, in part at least, in the

contexts out of which this conclusion is drawn. If this concise and comprehensive utterance be accepted as a summation or conclusion, then the reason or argument in support of it must or should be found in the context. There is an exegetical comment on this scripture in Calvin's Institutes, so forcible and conclusive that it is proposed to use some extracts from it as helpful in this inquiry. This will unquestionably give us a Calvinistic send-off. And yet our inference from the accepted comment will probably be different from what Calvin himself would have made. He says: "Wherefore the Lord Jesus, to exhibit a specimen from which the world might understand that he was come to extend rather than to limit the mercy of the Father, kindly received the infants that were presented to him, and embraced them in his arms, chiding the disciples who endeavored to forbid their approach to him, because they would keep those, of whom was the Kingdom of Heaven, at a distance from him who is the only way of entrance into it. * * * But it is necessary to consider the conduct of Christ with more attention than it receives from persons of this class. For it is not to be passed over as a thing of little importance that Christ commanded infants to be brought to him, and added as a reason for this command, *for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, and afterwards gave a practical testimony of his will when, embracing them in his arms, he commended them to his Father by his prayers and benedictions. * * * How unjust shall we be if we drive away from Christ those whom he invites to him; if we deprive them of the gifts with which he adorns them; if we exclude those whom he freely admits." Again: "The other cavils by which our opponents endeavor to elude the force of this passage only

betray their ignorance, for they argue that, as Christ said '*Suffer little children to come,*' they must have grown to such an age and stature as to be capable of walking. But they are called by the Evangelist *βρέφη* and *παιδιά*, two words used by the Greeks to signify little infants hanging on the breast.* The word '*come,*' therefore, is merely used to denote '*access.*' To such evasions are persons obliged to have recourse who resist the truth. Nor is there any more solidity in the objection that the Kingdom of Heaven is not said to belong to infants, but to those who resemble them, because the expression is not *of them*, but *of such* is the Kingdom of Heaven. * * * Nothing can be plainer than that he (Christ) intends those who are in a *state* of real infancy. And, to prevent this from being thought unreasonable, he adds, '*of such is the Kingdom of Heaven;*' and if infants be necessarily comprehended, it is beyond all doubt that the word '*such*' designates both infants themselves and those who resemble them" (B. IV, 16, 7).

In the confident and unequivocal language of this eminent expositor, "Beyond all doubt," these Scriptures designate infants "in a *state* of real infancy" and adult believers as alike belonging to the Kingdom of Heaven. "The word *such* designates both infants themselves and those who resemble them." Together, then, they constitute the group of *little ones* of whom the Saviour says, *Not one of them shall perish*. It has already been indicated that "real infancy" in the moral and scriptural sense embraces all children up to five or six years of age. The natural and

* Doubtless *παιδιά* would embrace as well small and young children, and not merely nurslings. Infants in the sense above explained, therefore.

insuperable barrier between this "real infancy" and the minimum adult age is death. Death is the seal of this "real infancy." All infants dying thus in infancy (*i. e.*, within this limitation of age) are, therefore, by the explicit language of the Saviour excluded from the number of those who perish; and, as there is no middle ground, they are included among the saved.

Any special virtue in this presentation arises from a recognition and due appreciation of the relation of this 14th verse of Matthew 18 to the previous di-

"A BIBLE STUDY."

Corrections:

1. p. 40, the 9th line from top, read *lost* instead of "cost."
2. p. 73, the 5th line from bottom, read *content* instead of "context."
3. p. 42, bottom line, after "five or six years of age," refer to pp. 31-32, 36-37, as qualifying the "state of real infancy."
4. p. 43, line 11 from top, read "I conceive that this exposition," *as qualified by the age limit in what precedes*, "is entirely valid," &c.

Ibid: line 15 from bottom, read—"for 350 years," *only lacking the above age limitation*, "infant nurselings," &c.

Same page, the 5th line from bottom, read—"accepted comment of Calvin," *as qualified above*, "is viewed," &c.

After "dying in infancy" (3rd line from bottom), *perhaps because of failing to recognize the above age limit of the "state of real infancy."* Calvin's view is indefinite.

Second line from bottom, "In this comment," *however*, "we can," &c.

betray their ignorance, for they argue that, as Christ said '*Suffer little children to come,*' they must have grown to such an age and stature as to be capable of walking. But they are called by the Evangelist *βρέφη* and *παιδιά*, two words used by the Greeks to signify little infants hanging on the breast.* The word '*come,*' therefore, is merely used to denote '*access.*' To such evasions are persons obliged to have recourse who resist the truth. Nor is there any more solidity in the objection that the Kingdom of Heaven is not said to belong to infants, but to those who resemble them, because

insuperable barrier between this "real infancy" and the minimum adult age is death. Death is the seal of this "real infancy." All infants dying thus in infancy (*i. e.*, within this limitation of age) are, therefore, by the explicit language of the Saviour excluded from the number of those who perish; and, as there is no middle ground, they are included among the saved.

Any special virtue in this presentation arises from a recognition and due appreciation of the relation of this 14th verse of Matthew 18 to the previous discoursing about infants. I conceive that this exposition is entirely valid and places the supreme lesson from these colloquies in a true light. (Appendix *a*, p. 73.)

Here, then, in a most emphatic way in these Scriptures, according to the faithful and plainly valid exposition of John Calvin, on record for 350 years, infant nurslings and little children (*βρέφη* and *παιδιά*) are classed with and put on the same footing in the Kingdom of Heaven with adult believers, and together they are by synecdoche alike spoken of without discrimination as "little ones" and "little ones that believe on me." If no little one is lost, then all dying in infancy are saved. The logic is like that of Paul in connection with his shipwreck: "For there shall not a hair perish from the head of any of you." "They all escaped safe to land" (Acts xxvii: 34, 44).

It should be stated, however, that whilst the accepted comment of Calvin is viewed as legitimately warranting the inference in support of the Saviour's utterance, yet Calvin nowhere explicitly recognizes the universal salvation of those dying in infancy. In this comment we can now see that he builded better than he at the time knew, as many another

honest and earnest inquirer for truth has done. Every man is entitled to the benefit of his inconsistency. (Appendix b, p. 74.)

This case of infants as thus given in the gospels does not stand alone.

2. Alongside of this New Testament case, thus somewhat logically formulated and validly sustaining a genuine presumption, should be placed the cumulative evidence of the classic Old Testament case of infant salvation. The narrative is in the xi and xii chapters of 2d Samuel. This son of David died when only seven days old, and hence uncircumcised. When on the death of the child the king's manner changed from mourning to cheerfulness, his servants were so surprised that he explained to them and said: "While the child was yet alive I fasted and wept, for I said, who knows whether Jehovah will not be gracious to me, that the child may live? But now he is dead, wherefore should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he will not return to me" (xii: 22-23). We learn from Psalms, undoubtedly Davidic, that it was in the immediate presence of God in Heaven that he expected to meet that child. This case teaches several important truths: 1, the immortality of infants; 2, the salvation of infants; 3, heavenly recognition; and, 4, salvation without church ceremonial. Yes, David expected to meet and know that child when he should behold the face of Jehovah in righteousness. 5. Moreover, it explodes the infidel perversion of the old Hebrew faith as ignorant of a future life. The Saviour brushed away that perversion when he reminded the Sadducees of the interview of God with Moses at the bush, in which he avowed himself the God of the living Abraham,

Isaac, and Jacob hundreds of years after their earthly death. David certainly knew and held this doctrine of immortality, which furnished the setting for his cheering hope of meeting loved ones in the hereafter.

3. A valid collateral support of the case just given of David's son, as having an important bearing on the belief in the universal salvation of all infants dying in infancy, is derived from the application of the logical canon of Professor Jevons, viz., "That what is true of one thing will be true of any other thing, on the condition of there being an exact resemblance between them in all material circumstances." He reduces all reasoning to this single type. In the case before us the truth is that, as to their salvation, in all material particulars the resemblance of all infants dying in infancy is conclusively exact. If, then, the salvation of a single infant be conceded, whether that of Bathsheba's child or some other, that supplies the nucleus around which the material, as distinguished from conventional or arbitrary, resemblances may cluster in support of the universal salvation of infants. Such a case seems to render pertinent the proverb *Ex uno discas omnia*. The notion that the Abrahamic covenant or promise effectively determined the salvation of this or any other particular infant or adult is alien to the record.

In refuting the reason alleged in support of irregular practices in the administration of infant baptism, Calvin says: "But it is alleged there is danger lest a child who is sick and dies without baptism should be deprived of the grace of regeneration. This I can by no means admit." He denies that the grace of God is more restricted now than of old, when it was "sufficiently efficacious to insure salvation before the eighth day" (B., 4, 15, 20, and 22).

4. At the final judgment the record is explicit. The criterion of works is alone recognized as the rule of judgment. The dead were judged out of the things which were written in the books, *according to their works*. Infants have no works to precede nor to follow for condemnation or reward. There emerges a distinction between the primal judgment on our race for disobedience and the final judgment. The primal judgment on account of Adam's sin was universal, but there was deliverance from it through Christ; hence the final condemnation will be on account of each one's own original and actual sin, unforgiven, and take effect consequently on only a part of the race, but from it there will be no deliverance. The one work which will favorably or fatally determine man's destiny at the final judgment, and for which infants are not accountable, is indicated in the Saviour's answer to the multitude who followed him to Capernaum from the miracle of feeding the five thousand. "They said, therefore, unto him, What must we do that we may work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent."

The exemption of infants from final condemnation, however, is certainly not due merely to the absence of sinful works or practices such as may lie to the charge of adults. Edwards speaks of "the method of God's *judgment* by which the *final state* of the wicked men is determined," and answers that "each one is dealt with according to *his own* wicked heart or sinful nature and practice." Original sin, unpardoned and unwashed away, undoubtedly goes forward to the judgment day, and associated with it are the actual transgressions which in each case have proceeded from it. Chalmers recognizes it as the common doctrine, "not merely that

all men are to blame for the sins they personally commit under the instigation of an evil nature transmitted by Adam, but that they are also to blame for the proper individual act of transgression done by Adam himself in the Garden of Eden." But it must not be forgotten that this act was a federal and not a private act, and that all represented incurred its guilt. May it not be said that every actual transgressor is accessory after the fact to Adam's first sin?

The one work of God that delivers adults is, as we have learned from Christ, the believing on him as the one sent of God. But the acquittal of infants will be on account of their regeneration by the Holy Spirit and cleansing from original sin and the pardon of inherited guilt on account of the imputed righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ. This establishes them fully and finally in the company of the redeemed and elect of God.

The venerable Doctor Miller was accustomed to say to the students at Princeton, when asked if all infants are saved that die in infancy, that we have a comfortable hope. Do not the considerations submitted touching Bible facts and teaching, without pursuing the matter further, warrant us in entertaining a comfortable faith in the universal salvation of infants dying in infancy?

If this doctrine be true, and as a matter of fact the enlightened and undeceived heart and intelligence of God's people hold it sacredly true, then the citizenship of Heaven will consist chiefly of those redeemed from the ranks of infancy and not of believing adults. It is the most wonderful exhibition of sovereign grace.

b. The second class of persons, to whom the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and is sent by the Son, is adults.

(1.) Of them it is just as true as of infants, that they must

be born *ἀνωθεν*—from above. This birth is the initiative of a new life in each case, the difference being that in the adult this new life ordinarily has a career in this world. This new life is not a matter of inheritance, nor the result of education, nor of spontaneous generation, as Drummond aptly points out (*The Natural Law*, &c.), nor the product of moral suasion. Moral influence and suasion of the most emphatic stamp failed to save man, when in a state of innocence, from the fall, and did not draw men to the Saviour when on earth, and is but an accessory to the Holy Spirit's agency in the recovery. "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born anew—*ἀνωθεν*." Those who believe on his name are "born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John i:13). "Wherefore if any man is in Christ he is a new creature (creation)." Under the impression that the new spiritual life is the result of moral suasion, Melancthon remarked that if he were as eloquent as the Holy Spirit he could convert as many souls; but he changed his mind, and confessed that he found that old Adam was stronger than young Melancthon. No; Paul may plant and Apollos water, but the increase is of God.

(2.) To assign the *locus* of this vital change in the human soul calls into requisition a sound psychology. The doctrine of innate ideas, once prevalent, has passed forever. All our knowledge of religion, as of other things, is acquired. But the human mind has innate powers, and every child born of a human mother has identically the same number and kind of powers as every other, whatever the nationality, condition, or color. The fundamental powers of intelligence, sensibility, and will, whose activities lie in the domain of consciousness, strike their roots down into a common sub-

soil of habits and dispositions whose changes are subconscious. These subconscious states, which do not rise to the height or grasp of consciousness, are the hiding-places of character, of internal impulse and motive. Here are the deep and permanent springs of activity. The change that passes upon the spirit in regeneration is located in this sub-soil or substratum, a sort of *tertium quid* above, or not so deep down as the essential constitution of the soul, but a substratum beneath and common to its powers; and, as the changes in this seat of the soul's habits are subconscious, that explains that we are not conscious ordinarily, if ever, of the new birth when it occurs, any more than we are of our natural birth (James' Varieties of Religious Views, p. 227?). Some claim to be conscious of it—in fact, to know the exact time and place of its occurrence, as was the case of Dr. Phinney, who gives the hour and minute and the log on which he was sitting when born into the kingdom. Doubtless some noticeable and perhaps extraordinary experience arrests the attention in such cases, but whether that be the change or some consequence or concomitant of it may be a question. However, it is only necessary to note that, if this immediate cognition occur in any case, it is certainly not the common experience of the children of God, and it is to any one a precarious proof of the new birth. The absence of it should be no surprise nor discouragement.

That of which we are or become distinctly conscious is a group of experiences so novel and unique that some such radical change as that termed the new birth is called for in explanation of them. I once was blind but now I see. Christ is now my joy and my song.

(3.) It is in this subconscious domain of the soul that the

finger of sovereignty secretly touches the springs of human action ; here sovereignty and freedom meet, for God is certainly sovereign and man is certainly free. Here, then, is their trysting place. Nothing is clearer as a corollary from this than that the will may be and is determined with certainty in perfect accordance with the will of God and man's own freedom. Every man is free who does as he pleases, whether he please to do right or wrong, and he always pleases according to the set and character of the dispositions of his soul. Man's naturally perverse dispositions prompt him to act perversely, and the touch of God's finger moves to the right, so that he either leaves us to our perverse, natural dispositions or contrariwise worketh in us through them to will and to do. "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God who worketh in you both to will and to work for his good pleasure" (Phil. ii : 13).

God, the Creator of all things, hath endued them with inherent causal energy, and as Governor he sustains and controls the same and ordereth all events to fall out, according to the several natures of second causes, either necessarily, freely, or contingently. Moral agents, as free second causes, possess naturally originating and operative energy. In his renewed state man also has coöperative energy which is divinely brought into requisition at every step of his growth in grace.

(4.) There is one thing common to all sane adults which differentiates them from infants, and that is the rational *exercise* of the natural or innate power of *faith*. This is pre-eminently the religious faculty. It may also be truthfully said that it is the profoundest of our philosophical powers. It is natural and not moral ability which determines man's

responsibility. Hence, as man has the natural endowments to know, love, and obey God, his alienation does not exempt him from the duty, though it does mar the free privilege and joyous choice of this service. If the adult has the native endowments to know and love and serve God, that makes him responsible for that service, even though he is indisposed to render it; if he has the natural, though not the moral, ability, the obligation is fixed. The Holy Spirit was sent forth in power to convict not the infant but the adult world of sinners by "enlightening their minds in the knowledge of Christ and enabling them to obey the call of the Gospel." This is not possible to infants. "Ye (adults) are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. Whom God set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood * * * for the showing of his righteousness at this present season, that he might himself be just and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus" (Rom. iii : 21-26). "Being, therefore, justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. v : 1).

(5.) It may be well, however, briefly to inquire, Does justification, as ordinarily viewed and accepted, bring, as it should, the peace of mind thus emphatically announced as a consequence thereof? Take the Shorter Catechism definition with a modification: "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins and accepteth us as [legally and personally] righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us and received by faith alone." Faith, together with the assured indwelling of the Holy Spirit as the creator of personal holiness, link the moral with the legal condition.

The pardon and acceptance here represented truthfully, as

solely on account of the righteousness of Christ as their meritorious ground, may be, and usually are, set forth as quite apart from the personal righteousness of the party thus justified. There often seems to be something lacking here. What is it? In a financial liability the law takes hold on the money in question and is fully satisfied when the money is touched. But sin in the government of God is the analogue of crime in the government of man, and criminal law takes hold on the person of the offender. Take the case of a certain State treasurer. When elected he was known to be a sportsman. His game soon got the better of him. He embezzled many thousands from the treasury of the State. His bondsmen at once paid the loss. That let him off financially. But he was indicted for the crime of theft, tried, and condemned to the penitentiary for nine years. Justification is no such disjointed patchwork as this. In like manner the law of God takes hold, not on the purse, but on the person of the sinner—the offender. When Christ undertook to meet its claims on us he rendered satisfaction, not with gold or silver, but in the holiness of his person and with his own blood. But surely not for himself did he suffer. Our personal release from the claims of the moral law, is not merely that of a bankrupt from the money claims of the civil law or the penal claims of the moral law, but that of a moral bankrupt from the preceptive and personal claims also of the law of God on character. The release proclaimed in justification, therefore, must take account, not only of our penal relation to the broken law, but also of personal character. It must be not simply forensic or formal, but personal. When the sinner is pardoned and adopted, must it not be that he is not acquitted on the

meritorious ground of Christ's righteousness, irrespective of his own personal, moral character, but that he is by virtue of his relation to Christ, who takes the place of the law in relation to him, viewed and treated in justification as though already personally holy? There is an established alliance between abolishing the penalty and abolishing the power of sin, between the removal of the guilt and of the removal of corruption. The *reatus* and the *culpa* must go together.

The putative and personal righteousness lock hands in justification. The clause of the Catechism definition of justification, bracketed above, indicates an essential feature of the transaction which should be articulately recognized. The objective and subjective definitions are extreme. Justification presupposes faith, and faith presupposes regeneration; yet both faith and the new birth are internal constituents of sanctifying righteousness, though not the meritorious ground of pardon and acceptance.

The sharp distinction, therefore, usually made between justifying and sanctifying righteousness, as though one were exclusive of the other, is neither technically nor realistically accurate. Two fundamental constituents of personal righteousness, therefore, are placed under requisition in pardon and acceptance. The actual experience of the new life and the personal exercise of faith accepting Christ are in distinct contemplation by the divine mind when man is accepted as righteous. Something more than the imputed righteousness is in contemplation. The imputed righteousness of Christ and the perfected personal righteousness make up the content of this concept of the righteousness of the glorified saint. They are not separable.

The whole procedure has a legal basis, and this validly brings into requisition a fundamental principle known to the law as the doctrine of equitable conversion, according to which that, which is provided for as rightfully ordered to be done, is viewed and treated as if already done. This principle treats that as done which ought to be, and is to be or must be done when adjudged or rendered necessary by the equities of the case. The reasonable lapse of time in the process of realization is not material.

The story is that a will came into the hands of an English lawyer in the latter part of the eighteenth century, which directed that certain real estate should be sold and the proceeds used in settlement of some claims. The lawyer tossed the document with a guinea on the table of a young man in his office named Edward Law, with some remark to the effect that there was a conundrum for him. The obvious difficulty, on the very face of the will, was that the effect of what was directed would be to break the descent of the land and to vest in the legatee a chattel interest to that extent in the realty. The established law was that real estate could not be dealt with as chattels. Very well, the young man worked up the case and submitted to the court that what was proposed, though out of the ordinary course of the law, subserved strictly the ends of justice. The court sustained his position and gave the legatee an interest in the land, which was hedged about by the law with vastly more technicality than chattel, to the extent directed not as land, but as chattel, and the land was that far treated as if converted into chattel. This young lawyer afterwards received a retainer and brought forward a case, subversive of this decision in favor of equitable conversion, and the court

refused to hear him, remarking that it was useless for him to try to overturn his former argument. This young man became Lord Ellenborough and Chief Justice of England, conducted the defense of Warren Hastings, and died in 1818, aged sixty-eight. This principle of equitable conversion is now accepted without question as settled law throughout the civilized world.

In Romans viii: 28-30, is that memorable *sortes* in which, according to the all-comprehensive purpose of God, the stages or steps of salvation are connected as the links of an adamant chain. To be justified is inseparable from being rendered conformable to the image of the Son. The sanctification is so certainly coupled with justification as to be viewed as one whole. The perseverance of the pardoned sinner is so assured as that he is at once entered on the books and treated as a saint. This principle only emerged into the consciousness and practice of the legal profession in the lifetime of Lord Ellenborough, who died in the early part of the last century, and yet of old it seems to have had an important bearing on the divine procedure in delivering man from sin. The righteousness of Christ received by faith not only assures acquittal from the penal claims of the law, but as surely also secures the work of the Holy Spirit in conforming the character to its preceptive claims. This faith works by love, purifies the heart, and overcomes the world. Faith tends to spiritual sight, promises to possession, and hopes to fruition.

Another apt illustration of this comprehensive view of justification, as covering the contemplated perfecting of the whole sphere of man's life, the first step in which is taken in regeneration and manifested in the exercise of faith, may be

obtained from an incident connected materially with the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, in 1789. Patrick Henry vigorously opposed its adoption in the Virginia convention and delayed action for a month. Mr. Jefferson, who was abroad and favored the adoption, wrote advising to make the rectifications of the instrument conditions *subsequent* and not *precedent*, trusting to the honor of those with whom they were dealing to join with them in subsequently perfecting the document by amendments. This counsel prevailed, and hence the first ten amendments of the Constitution were adopted at once. The imperfect instrument was accepted with the understanding that its perfecting should be an assured after-care. The doctrine of perseverance is comprehended in justification.

(6.) A few things seem to be uniquely consequent on any proper view of the removal of the moral obstacle:

1. One is that the pardon set forth in the Gospel evidences the divine origin and character of the whole scheme, both in its conception and in its administration. It is profoundly original and without parallel. It is utterly impracticable in any human government to thus freely dispense pardon. It is possible and safe only on the part of a ruler who can change the heart of the pardoned offender. There are more than (50,000) fifty thousand inmates of misnamed penitentiaries in our country. It matters little what might be the professions and appeals that would lead to it, a general pardon or jail-delivery by the President and the Governors of the States, letting loose these people, would be like threatening to break up as by a moral earthquake the very foundations of safety, peace, and good order in society. There would and could be no assurance, that those released would

not go forth with the same depraved dispositions and impulses which had placed them under duress. The release of individuals now and then is done cautiously, in view of the contingencies; but in the government of God every one who is penitent is freely pardoned and given a new heart, and the Holy Spirit of love and obedience is vouchsafed unto them. The contrast is radical and palpable. The conditions of deliverance are such as to induce an abiding peace of soul and godly fear. "There is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared." This is original and divine. Omniscience, love, and power unite. The conditions of its bestowment are awe-inspiring.

2. Another consequent and associated feature of the case is the changed relation of the pardoned to the law of God. The relation to the law is no longer direct, but only mediate through Christ, who *is its end*. "Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness to every one that believeth" (Rom. x: 4). All the pardoned are enlisted under the bloodstained banner of the Lord Jesus Christ as soldiers in the army of the redeemed, and his will and word are now their law, and as completely control their individual and collective movements as the movements of a worldly army are controlled by the commands of its general. His word is their law of life and death. Chalmers states this transfer of allegiance thus: "Having removed the law through his death out of the station it had before occupied as the first husband, he then rose again and now stands in its place as the second husband. We are emancipated from our old relationship to the law, and as disciples we have entered into a new relationship to Christ, with all the obligations of service which spring therefrom." This is scriptural and important. The wife

owes a duty to her second husband (Christ) as well as to the first (the law). Christ our second husband has his claims upon our obedience and dutiful regards as really as did the law which he has supplanted. It is here that, with the law, the predominant feeling which prompted our services may have been of servile obligation, mixed with great fearfulness, because of the deficiencies into which we were perpetually falling. But with Christ the predominant feeling which prompts our services is the sweet and spontaneous affection to one from whom we are ever sure to obtain the kindest indulgence. "The love of Christ constraineth us." It is not the service of a cold, grim code, but to a loving person—freedom and not slavery. But still it is evident that under this second economy there will be service, possibly much greater in amount and certainly far worthier in principle, than all that was ever rendered or possible under the law, ceremonial and moral. Hence the freedom and the cheerfulness of the new obedience; this direct service of Christ is the soul of Christian liberty and joy, and it is proof against temptation and anti-nomianism. Our life is hid with Christ in God. We obey the moral law mediately through Christ, who is its embodiment, and hence our absolute guarantee of meeting all its claims for the future as his righteousness cancels the past claims. The difference between the obedience to an abstract code and to a concrete person is illustrated by the obedience of children to the law of the State. They may never have seen a statute book or code. They simply obey the parents whom they love and who, as law-abiding citizens, are embodiments of the law of the State to them. By obeying their law-abiding parents they obey the laws of the State, though they may never have seen a statute book. Thus we obey the law of God by obeying Christ.

3. This second submission and obedience of the Christian directly to Christ, involves not only the question of our relation to the Jehovah Jesus Christ, but also of his relation to the moral law. Did Christ consciously and of deliberate purpose live the life that the broken moral law of God required of all subject to it, or was his life an exception and merely one of filial spontaneity transcending the exacting legal claims on a subject of the moral government of God?

The expressions God's law and the law of God, or Moses' law and the law of Moses, often include both the ceremonial and the moral law; but Christ's conformity to the Mosaic law of ordinances, from the time of his circumcision to the paschal supper, is so much a matter of course as to need no special or detailed notice; but, leaving out of view the writings of Paul and Luke, what is, in brief, the evidence furnished by the evangelists in their gospels and letters that the Christ had the requirements of the moral law steadily before him and fully complied therewith—that he trod the narrow path of perfect obedience to its demands? Only a very partial notice of this topic is practicable.

(1.) To begin at the beginning, in the annunciation to Joseph (Matt. ii : 21) we find the following injunction: "And she shall bring forth a son; and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for it is he that shall save his people from their sins." The name Jesus (Jehovah—Saviour) is significant, therefore, of the burden of his mission to earth as a Divine Saviour from sin, and he gave evidence of being fully aware of this. The fact of the incarnation here announced was a manifest assumption of the legal and moral obligations resting on every man in the government of God. During his public life he

was reproached for associating with publicans and sinners but when he heard it he said: "But go ye and learn what this meaneth. * * * I came not to call the righteous, but sinners" (Matt. ix:13). He evidently understood himself. But we have no scriptural conception of man as a sinner apart from his relations to the moral law. This is the import of the definition of sin given by the evangelist John in his first epistle, chapter iii:4: "Every one that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness—*anomia*." He had previously stated: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us. My little children, these things I write unto you that ye may not sin. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but for the whole world."

The forgiveness and cleansing here spoken of suggest the external and internal aspects of the lawlessness of sin. The lawless fail to measure up to the standard of the moral law, and hence fall under its disapproval or condemnation; and when, in this immediate connection, it is said, "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus, his son, cleanseth us from all sin" (i John, i:7; ch. ii:1-2), the cross rises before us and the thought is vividly taken back to the atoning sacrifices of the old economy which therein found their realization. The legal as well as the moral or spiritual element is pervasive of such scriptures—pervasive, therefore, of the Saviour's actual life as on record.

(2.) In proof of the consciously legal aspect and purpose of the Saviour's entire earthly life, as exploiting the domain of sin as a rescuer therefrom, the Sermon on the Mount is a most pronounced witness (Matt. v-vii).

This discourse was given at the beginning of his public ministry, and the supreme subject of it is undoubtedly the moral law. The exposition of it therein given is the most incisive, profound, and comprehensive on record. The Rabbis had so overlaid both the ceremonial and the moral law with their traditions as to almost smother the life out of both of them. In the course of his public ministry the Pharisees angrily reproached him because some of his disciples ate their bread with unwashed hands, contrary to the traditions of the elders. He with spirit replied—retorted—ye leave the commandments of God and hold fast the traditions of men.

"Moses said, honor thy father and thy mother. Ye no longer suffer him to do aught for his father or his mother, making void the word of God by your tradition, which ye have delivered; and many such like things ye do" (Mark vii: 2, 3, 8, 12-13). The principle of this isolated case of rescuing the 5th commandment by sloughing off the perverting accretions of the Rabbis and elders is effectively elaborated in the chapters of Matthew, containing the Sermon on the Mount, wherein several of the commandments of the decalogue are rescued from the overlying rubbish, and various current false doctrines are repudiated and valuable positive lessons are impressively and beautifully presented and inculcated.

The exalted view of the moral law given in this discourse has permanent value, but its immediate importance arose

from the circumstance that the Saviour set it forth before the public as the standard of living for himself as well as for others. Hence the importance of his announcement: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished" (Matt. v:17-18).

On the cross, immediately before his last words, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit," Jesus, referring to his life-work, made the announcement, "It is finished" (Jno. xix:30).

He had said to his disciples:

"If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love" (Jno. xv:10). As he assumed to be a law unto his disciples, so his Father had been a law unto him.

Brief notice has been previously taken of this exposition of the moral law, and it is beyond question the most incisive on record. And it is a circumstance perhaps worthy of notice, as indicating that, in undertaking to fully meet the exalted and exacting requirements of this holy law of God as thus expounded, he was drawn and actuated by love, the name of the Father is mentioned in it thirteen (13) times; whereas in the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures God is spoken of as Father only seventeen (17) times. When but twelve he was absorbed by his Father's business, and the language of the Psalmist was the breath of his life,

"O, how love I thy law!
It is my meditation all the day."

—Ps. 119:97.

(3.) On Tuesday before the Friday of his crucifixion, which was his last appearance in public, and it was in the courts of the Temple, after he had made such unanswerable responses to the hostile questionings of the Herodians, the Pharisees, and the Sadducees as to silence them, a lawyer, who had been listening to the controversy, stepped forward and asked him the important but difficult and unsettled question, "What commandment is the first of all?" Jesus answered, "The first is, Hear, O Israel! Jehovah our God is one Jehovah; and thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. The second is this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these." And when Jesus saw that he accepted the answer without quibbling, he said unto him, in view of his open-minded candor in receiving the truth, "Thou art not far from the Kingdom" (Deut. vi : 4; Mark. xii : 28-34). One of the Evangelists records the added remark, well worth preserving, "On these two commandments the whole law hangeth, and the prophets."

It is not practicable to pursue this topic farther at this time. It is seen that at the opening and at the closing of the record of the Saviour's public ministry the moral law of God was conspicuously before his mind. Even his baptism numbered him legally with the transgressors. The intervening record presents much of like import, as in his answer to the young ruler about keeping the commandments, but distinguishing as ever between the letter and the spirit, and indicating the superiority of faith in himself to faith in riches. The law is appealed to to convince him of sin and helplessness when understood aright, and not as the way of life.

Jesus' ministry was among the Israelites who had been taught a knowledge of the true God, and of his written law; but Paul was commissioned to bear the message of salvation from sin to the Gentiles, and he based his teachings on identically the same foundation of the moral law as did Jesus. He teaches the very doctrine of the evangelist in setting forth the life-work of Christ, that "sin is lawlessness." He writes the Romans, "There is no respect of persons with God"—the true God, before whom he arraigns them as sinners. "For as many as have sinned without the [written] law shall also perish without the [written] law: and as many as have sinned under the [written] law shall be judged by the [written] law. When Gentiles that have not the [written] law do by nature the things of the [written] law, these, not having the [written] law, are the law unto themselves, in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them."

In a word, it is the same law in two languages—The Conscience and the Moral Law—as it is written in the heart and as it is written in the Bible. Jews and Gentiles are under the same law of God. Any lawlessness, as tested aright by either of these standards, is sin, and requires forgiveness and cleansing. This is the gospel of Paul, and this is the gospel of Jesus. It is identically the same gospel, and each announces the same deliverance from the same law. In each all are sinners. In each the blood or cross of Jesus, the Son, cleanseth us—Jew and Gentile—from all sin, and in each, "if we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive our sins and to cleanse us from all

unrighteousness." In both the love of souls and the love of God, the hatred of sin and of Satan, are alike conspicuous as the prime, internal motive force of attraction and repulsion.

They who separate Paul from Christ as a teacher of the Gospel are guilty of divorcing what God has joined together as one. "For to me to live is Christ" (Phil. i : 21). "For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's" (Rom. xiv : 8).

Paul received his commission as an apostle directly from Christ (Gal. i : 1). He had about half a dozen interviews with Christ, and received his gospel directly from him: "For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it from man, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. i : 12). Paul's gospel was not second hand, but as directly from Christ as the gospel on record in the evangelists, to say the least. This is beyond question if Paul was a truthful and honest man. No inspired writer was more perfectly the mouth-piece of Jesus Christ than was Paul. Back from Paul to Christ! is the slogan of reckless presumption, and is about as senseless as would be back from Jesus Christ to God!

The Saviour commends the Jews for searching the Scriptures (Jno. v : 39) because they "bear witness" of himself. Addressing the disciples on the way to Emmaus, who were utterly despondent over the crucifixion, he said: "O foolish men and slow of heart to believe in all that prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ—the Messiah—to suffer these things and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets he interpreted to them

in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke xxiv : 25-27). Very soon after, on that same evening, he appeared to "the eleven" whilst the disciples from Emmaus were relating to them their interview with the risen Christ, and having given them convincing evidence of his identification he repeated his appeal to Moses and the other Scriptures and added : "Thus it is written, that the Christ—the Messiah—should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem." In the calm light of his resurrection sojourn of forty days, with the vision of his complete earthly career vividly in view, he reminds them that what had occurred was what he had told them, whilst with them, must take place in fulfillment of what Moses and the other Scriptures had foretold concerning himself. He had not been taken by surprise, nor was he in the least disconcerted, but ever true to his mission as Jesus, he enjoins them to publish the gospel of deliverance from sin through or in his name unto all the nations" (Luke xxiv : 47).

Deliverance from sin is deliverance from the guilt of lawlessness under a broken law and from indwelling lust which begets sin. Law was the backbone of the old Scriptures that testified of the Christ—the Messiah—who was to come and to "bare the sin of many" and open the fountain in the house of David for the cleansing of sin and uncleanness; and the law is the vertebral column of the gospel.

4. A final word must be spoken respecting the relation of the sacraments of the supper and of baptism to the two obstacles which have been under consideration in what precedes :

(1.) The supper. In it there are two elements and five sacramental actions. The elements are bread and wine. The sacramental actions are the consecration of the elements, setting them, or so much of them as may be used, apart from a common to a sacred use, the breaking of the bread and the pouring of the wine, the giving of the elements to the communicants, and finally the actual reception and participation of the elements by the worshippers. Now, every item in this count is significant.

When the elements are, by an act of worship, consecrated or set apart, they signify the doctrine of the incarnation: This is my body; this is my blood. By *synechdoche*, a part is taken for the whole. Before this consecration the elements have no special significance. The bunting on the shopman's counter means nothing; but when the red and white stripes with a field of blue with stars are set apart and combined in a flag, then it is full of meaning and symbolizes the power and honor of the United States.

The breaking of the bread and the pouring of the wine symbolize the doctrine of the atonement—body broken and blood shed for sin. The breaking of the bread is part of the institution and its omission is a mutilation of the ordinance.

The distribution, or gift of the elements to the company of believers, signifies the grace of God in the unspeakable gift of his son to become incarnate, live and die for sinners.

But no one has, in fact, communed till both the elements are taken and received into the system. And this means the act of faith receiving Christ as offered in the Gospel. "By grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, that no man should glory" (Eph. ii: 8).

That on which the soul feeds in this ordinance is not the elements, not the bread and wine, but the truth thus symbolized. These four fundamental truths—the incarnation, atonement, grace, and faith—personally apprehended and appreciated, bring into conscious realization what Jesus has done for us as a Saviour from sins. This is intelligible and is all the mystery there is about it. If you have faith personally in these truths the sacrament is simply a pictorial sermon as a means of grace and sensible seal of the covenant promises of God.

(2.) Baptism is likewise a symbolic ordinance. The element is water. Among other and important uses, water especially serves as a cleansing agent. When brought into relation to the body it removes defilement. As water cleanses and purifies the body of uncleanness, so the Holy Spirit washes away the turpitude, the depravity of sin from the soul.

As the supper symbolizes the work of the Christ, so the sacrament of baptism symbolizes the work of the Holy Spirit. The two taken together pictorially signify the removal of both the obstacles which bar our way to heaven. Faith and holiness are the watchwords that gain admittance to heaven.

The spiritual meaning of the ordinances of the Mosaic dispensation has passed over into the new ordinances of the Christian dispensation, whilst the old ordinances as sensible observances have been superseded, the passover by the Lord's supper and circumcision which, as an ordinance, signified by a surgical operation the cutting away or separation from the natural descent of original sin and all the corrupt consequences, by baptism. The circumcision of the heart meant

a new heart, so that the symbolic lesson from circumcision was the same as that from baptism—the removal of sin from the soul. The significance of the old ordinances is concentrated in these two Sacraments. The lesson is not lost, but framed anew.

Long after the Christ had taught Nicodemus that we must be born again—born of the spirit from above, symbolized by the cleansing of water—the Jewish converts insisted that entrance into the Christian church should be through circumcision. They seem to have attributed to it something more than the significance of a mere fleshly mark, and esteemed it as equivalent to baptism. However, when Christ came the obligation of the sensible religious observances of the ceremonial ordinances ceased. Their aim was accomplished. They no longer had any binding claims. The freedom of gospel service superseded the ceremonial law. The observance of circumcision, temple worship, and the festivals were no longer obligatory and became things indifferent. Hence, when the Jewish converts engaged in certain ceremonial practices through the force of habit or custom, it was not as a Christian duty. And the attempt to make circumcision a condition of membership in the church and Christian fellowship was effectively resisted, and after a comparatively brief struggle abandoned.

It came to be understood that as the supper succeeded and superseded the passover, so baptism succeeded and superseded circumcision.

There is nothing new or novel in either sacrament. All they do is to exhibit symbolically the old truths of the Bible familiarly held forth verbally and ceremonially. The significance of the whole scheme of salvation, in its great funda-

mentals, is sensibly and significantly set forth by them in a new manner. The truth is old, but the sacramental manner of sensibly symbolizing or picturing it to the imagination is new and as impressive as simple.

Let it be noted that it is from the very nature of these ordinances as symbolic that the taking of a single crumb of the consecrated bread or a single drop of the consecrated wine is as complete a communion as the eating of a loaf of bread or drinking a goblet of wine. In like manner, and for the same unanswerable reason, a single drop of water brought into contact with the body—whether the body moves to it or it to the body—in the solemn terms of administration presented by our Lord, as completely symbolizes the cleansing of the soul from sin by the Holy Ghost as a tank full or an ocean of water.

The actual change of soul from death in sin to life in God effected by the regeneration which is the initial act of the Spirit's symbolized work on the soul is like rising from the grave of sin to life. It is this subjective change or awakening that is analogous to the resurrection or awakening of Christ and not the mode of baptism itself.

The rising of the soul from spiritual death to spiritual life is the real point of comparison; for the body of the Saviour rose from physical death to physical life. Analogy is a resemblance of relations and not a direct resemblance of individual things; and so here the relation of the dead soul to the living soul is like to the relation of the dead body to the living body of the Christ. The analogy thus goes on all fours, as the saying is; but the four terms of these relations cannot be derived from the mode of baptism, for it is a case where the relations rest on the difference be-

tween the facts of life and death, neither of which is realized in the mode of baptism. Those who think they find the resemblance there misapprehend the case and simply confound the symbol with the thing symbolized—a lapse from Bible truth as real as that of transmuting the eucharist.

The ordinance addresses the senses, but the significance of it is spiritual and points to the removal of the moral obstacle from between man and heaven, as the Supper points to the removal of the legal obstacle.

This resurrection of the soul, as distinguished from the bodily resurrection, is preëminently and articulately designated in Scripture “the first resurrection.” All who have been or shall be regenerated and raised to this newness of life are in some way associated with Christ in his mediatorial dominion. “Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection * * * over these the second death hath no power” (Rev. xx: 6; John v: 21, 25; Eph. ii: 4–6).

“We were baptized into his death. * * * We were buried with him through baptism into death that like as Christ was raised from the dead * * * so we also might walk in newness of life * * * Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God” (Rom. vi: 3, 4, 11). In baptism confession is made of faith in the reality of the sensible bodily resurrection of Christ to a new life not simply nor mainly as a mere historic fact, but as evidencing and guaranteeing the exercise of the same power in raising the soul from death in sin to a new life in God. “Through him (ye) are believers in God that raised him from the dead * * * so that your faith and hope might be in God” (i Peter i: 21). In Col. ii: 11–13, appeal is first made to circumcision as having the same confessional import as baptism,

and transition is immediately made thereto: "Buried with him in baptism * * * raised with him through faith in the working of God who raised him from the dead." Our resurrection is then described as spiritual. The physical resurrection of Christ confirms our faith in God's power to effect our spiritual resurrection. As God raised Christ's dead body to life, so he is competent and pledged to raise the dead soul to life. As in healing the paralytic and pardoning his sins, the physical and spiritual go together.

All this is the work of the same spirit of God. As faith in the bodily resurrection of Christ implies faith in and points to the resurrection of the soul, so the surprising reflex of this truth is seen in Rom. viii: 11, where the indwelling of this spirit of God becomes the assurance of our bodily resurrection.

S. S. LAWS.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,

1733 Q Street Northwest, March 30, 1903.

APPENDIX

(Page 43.)

a. If there is a fallacy in this Bible argument for infant salvation, it can be pointed out. Risking the imputation of pedantry, a skeleton of the argument will be given, as helpful to such an exposure.

“Even so, it is not the will of your (my) Father who is in Heaven that one of these little ones should perish” (Matt. xviii:14).

In the sense of this utterance :

E. No little one is lost.

A. All infants dying in infancy are little ones.

E. No infant dying in infancy is lost.

By simple conversion :

All infants dying in infancy are saved.

The Saviour's conclusion gives the major premise. The burden of the proof rests on the minor premise (A), and that proof is submitted in the text.

It is sometimes said to be difficult to prove a negative. It may be recalled that of the 19 valid forms of the syllogism in the Aristotelic system, 13 are negative. The form here given, as underlying the Bible argument of the text, is the familiar *celarent*—E, A, E in the first figure.

The form is all right, and if the context is not faulty, then this Bible argument is made good. All infants dying in infancy must, of course, include “elect infants dying in infancy ;” and if only elect infants are saved, then *elect infants* and *all infants dying in infancy* are coextensive.

b. As stated, the two parts of this paper were read in May and November, 1902.

I desire to state that in the interval between those readings a little book of 162 pages on the subject of infant salvation by the Rev. John W. Stagg, D. D., of Charlotte, N. C., was published by the *Presbyterian Committee of Publication*, Richmond, Va. The title of the book is "Calvin, Twisse, and Edwards on the Universal Salvation of those Dying in Infancy." I received it at the Warm Sulphur Springs, Bath county, Virginia, read it at once, and on the next Sabbath spoke of it in the pulpit and recommended all interested in the subject to get it at the moderate cost of fifty cents. I have not seen any critical review of this book, but various, and some of them careful, notices of it have been published, mostly in praise and commendation. The praises have sometimes been almost extravagant, and any intimations of criticism have been very mild.

But of all the notices which I have seen the one which has most interested me is the following :

"The Reverend JOHN W. STAGG, D. D.

"MY DEAR SIR: Will you accept my cordial thanks for your little book on *The Universal Salvation of Infants*. I have read it with much interest and benefit, and, I may say, with appreciation and approval of the reasoning and conclusions.

"Your estimate of Calvin, I am able to state from my own study of his life and opinions, is just and accurate. He is one of the much-maligned and misunderstood men of history, in regard to his opinions upon this as well as other

questions. If he did not teach universal infant salvation directly and positively, yet he taught nothing contrary to the tenet, but opened the way for it as a logical deduction from the Scriptures and from his own opinions. In this matter he was in advance of the theologians of his day, and even of some orthodox divines of later times.

“CHARLES W. SHIELDS.

“PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, N. J., *Feb.* 17, 1903.”

The Rev. Charles Woodruff Shields, D. D., LL. D., has been “Professor of the Harmony of Science and Revealed Religion in Princeton University” for thirty years, and recently retired as emeritus. This endorsement ought to satisfy any reasonable craving on the part of Dr. Stagg for the approval of his book by some one eminently competent to appreciate and form an impartial opinion of it. Dr. Shields is a man of extraordinary ability, and he has been devoted for a lifetime to the study and teaching of the subject of revealed religion. Not to mention other works of Dr. Shields, his *Final Philosophy* shows his critical mastery of the opinions of the world’s great thinkers.

I heartily agree with the following utterance: “If he (Calvin) did not teach universal infant salvation directly and positively, yet he taught nothing contrary to the tenet, but opened the way for it as a logical deduction from the Scriptures and from his own opinions. In this matter he was in advance of the theologians of his day, and even of some orthodox divines of later times.”

Since reading Dr. Stagg’s little book last September I have carefully read the whole of *The Institutes of the Christian Re-*

ligion, by John Calvin, over thirteen hundred royal octavo pages. We have from his pen these explicit words: "Now it is certain that some infants are saved; and that they are previously regenerated by the Lord, is beyond all doubt" (B. iv, 16, 17). In criticising certain irregularities in the administration of baptism to young children he says: "But it is alleged, there is danger, lest a child who is sick and dies without baptism, should be deprived of the grace of regeneration. This I can by no means admit. * * * As though the grace of God were more restricted now than it was under the law; it leads to the conclusion that Christ came not to fulfill the promises but to abolish them" (B. iv, 15, 20). In section 23 Calvin says: "But this controversy—respecting God's grace to infants—will easily be decided by the establishment of this principle: That infants are not excluded from the Kingdom of Heaven who happen to die before they have had the privilege of baptism." Again: "But how, it is inquired, are infants regenerated who have no knowledge of good or evil? We reply," says Calvin, "that the work of God is not yet without existence, because it is not observed or understood by us."

However, nowhere in these Institutes does he explicitly affirm the universal salvation of infants; and yet he taught nothing contrary to it; "but," as Dr. Shields says, "he opened the way for it as a logical deduction from the Scriptures and from his own opinions." This has been illustrated in this paper from the use—the legitimate use—made of his able comments on what the gospels say of children. And he never in a single instance consigns a single infant soul to final perdition nor gives valid warrant for such an inference. Without protracting these remarks, I will close

with the quotation of a memorable utterance of Dr. Charles Hodge (Theol., vol. 3, 605) in response to Dr. Krauth's criticisms. He says:

"We are sorry to see that Dr. Krauth labors to prove that the Westminster Confession teaches that only a certain part, or some of those who die in infancy, are saved; this he does by putting his own construction on the language of that confession. We can only say that we never saw a Calvinistic theologian who held that doctrine. We are not learned enough to venture the assertion that no Calvinist ever held it; but if all Calvinists are responsible for what every Calvinist has ever said, and all Lutherans are responsible for everything Luther or Lutherans have ever said, then Dr. Krauth as well as ourselves will have a heavy burden to carry."

The dedication of Dr. Stagg's book to a mother in response to whose urgent request it was written, that others might share her joy, recalls the following consolatory lines:

Weeping mothers, strong in faith,
Safe in heaven your loved ones see;
List to what the Saviour saith—
Little children, come to me!

